

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 38, 40-42, 44, and 47-49 are currently pending in the application. Claims 38 and 47-49 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the Specification, for example at page 3, ll. 8-10. No claims have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 38, 40-42, 44, 47-49 are present for examination. Claims 38, 47, 48, and 49 are independent claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 48 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter because it represents a disembodied software program.

Applicants submit that claim 48 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Yamamoto in view of Malcolm

Claims 38, 41, and 47-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,111,151 issued to Yamamoto et al. (“**Yamamoto**”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903 issued to Malcolm (“**Malcolm**”).

Yamamoto generally discloses a system for providing language translators with contextual information for text to be translated. *Yamamoto*, Abs. Yamamoto's Fig. 4 describes the translation process. Particularly, company A, located in country A, builds and packages localization files that are to be translated and ships them to company B, located in country B. Company B then performs testing and translation on the packaged files. *Id.*, col. 4, ll. 51-67, *see also id.*, at Fig. 4. Yamamoto further discloses that during the translation process a "pop-up" editor window accompanies the text to be translated. The "pop-up" editor will appear when, for example, a "button" with the text "CANCEL" displayed on it is selected. The translator then enters the translation of the text in the editor window. *Id.*, col. 5, ll. 14-29, *see also id.*, col. 6, ll. 53-59. Malcolm generally discloses a method for improved user interfaces for applications which support multilingual users. *Malcolm*, Abs.

In contrast, claim 38, and similarly claims 47-49, as amended, recite that an "interface is configured to allow for translation of the modified source text *concurrently with development and modification of the source text.*" (Emphasis provided.) While Yamamoto and Malcolm describe methods for facilitating the translation process, both fail to teach or suggest a process which allows for development and translation to occur concurrently. Stated differently, both Yamamoto and Malcolm allow for the translation process to occur after the completion of the software coding, whereas claim 38 allows for translation to occur at the same time as the coding, or concurrently (*i.e.*, in real-time) with the coding of the software. Nowhere are Applicants able to find any teaching or suggestion of such a feature in either Yamamoto of Malcolm.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 38 is believed to be allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm. Independent claims 47-49 recite similar elements to some of those described above with respect to claim 38, and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Dependent claims 40-42 and 44 depend from claim 38 and therefore are believed to be allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 40 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,015 issued to Peterson et al. ("**Peterson**").

Dependent claim 40 depends from claim 38. As noted above, claim 38 is allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm, and it is believed that Peterson does not remedy the failings of Yamamoto and Malcolm noted above. Hence, claim 40 is believed to be allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable base claims over Yamamoto, Malcolm, and Peterson, individually, or when combined in any combination.

Claims 42 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm, as applied to claims 38 and 41, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426 issued to Lakritz ("**Lakritz**").

Dependent claims 42 and 44 depend from claim 38. As noted above, claim 38 is allowable over Yamamoto in view of Malcolm, and it is believed that Lakritz does not remedy the failings of Yamamoto and Malcolm noted above. Hence, claims 42 and 44 are believed to be allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable base claims over Yamamoto, Malcolm, and Lakritz, individually, or when combined in any combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Gray/
Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:ss/slb
61378411 v1